

The Sun

TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 1908.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

Subscription by Mail, Postpaid.
DAILY, Per Month, 60 Cts.
DAILY, Per Year, 6.00
SUNDAY, Per Year, 2.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year, 8.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month, 70 Cts.
Postage to foreign countries added.

Published by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association, at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President and Treasurer of the Association, William M. Laffan, 150 Nassau street; Secretary of the Association, Franklin Harlett, 5 Nassau street.

The daily and Sunday Sun is on sale in London at Murray's Exchange, 100 Pall Mall, and in the Northumberland Avenue, Pall Mall American and Colonial Exchange, Carlton street, Regent street, and New's Steamship Agency, 17 Green street, Leicester square.

Paris office, 25 Rue de la Harpe. The daily and Sunday Sun is on sale at 10 Rue de la Harpe, near the Grand Hotel, 10 Rue de la Harpe, near the Grand Hotel, 10 Rue de la Harpe, near the Grand Hotel.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have their articles returned they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

The most important delegate to the Democratic State convention to-day will sit in the front row, visible to everybody with eyesight. He is known in politics by the fine old name of OPPORTUNITY. The gentleman isn't always in attendance, we are sorry to say, as these Democratic conclaves in the Empire State; this year he's going to be there, sure enough. The burlesque funeral performance in Carnegie Hall on Saturday made his coming inevitable; the Republican convention, indeed, wrote his credentials for him; and his presence is worth more to the party—we say it with no disrespect to the other statesmen, sages and leaders assembled—than the combined wisdom of all the rest of them. Will the Democratic convention appreciate that fact? Will the chairman recognize this delegate when he arises? Will the convention heed his counsel, or is his voice to be lost in the mistimed noise and the insensate strife of the factions from Kings, from Jefferson, from Oswego and from Albany? The best friends of the Democratic cause are those who will heal or howl down the fool contests before OPPORTUNITY gets discomfited and walks out of the hall. Not to overwork the parable, is this convention going to show common sense and ordinary political perception?

A Labor of Sisypheus.

As an industrious tariff reformer Representative PERKINS of New York, a Republican, is not receiving the recognition in the House which he craves. By the kindness of Mr. Foss of Illinois, who allowed him twenty minutes on Friday last, he aired his grievances:

"I have sometimes felt that a bill seeking to modify the tariff in the Committee on Ways and Means as now constituted had about the same prospect of a favorable report as a bill imposing a severe penalty on bigamy would have if introduced into a Congress composed of Mormons. [Laughter.] But, Mr. Chairman, I have persevered, etc."

The monotony of his failures to interest the Speaker and make an impression upon SERENO PAYNE has even led Mr. PERKINS to doubt the professions of the greater man who is behind:

"Now, the President of the United States, Mr. Chairman, as we all know, has long been in sympathy with the cause of tariff reform and tariff revision, and yet I must admit that in that cause he has not shown all the zeal and the ardor which he has displayed in some matters in which he has turned his attention. [Laughter.]

"He has proceeded in the attack upon the tariff with a certain degree of calm deliberation that has not always been characteristic of him as a commander. [Laughter.]

The mildness of the summons to revise the tariff which was sounded in the Roosevelt conventions in Massachusetts and New York seems to bear Mr. PERKINS out. But he is not cast down or morose. He has his fun in flinging his little firecrackers into the arena and hearing them explode among his Republican colleagues. And when some kind friend gives him time Mr. PERKINS amiably exposes the peridy of the standpatters who see a new light only when a State convention meets in the interests of a favorite son.

The New British Cabinet.

As was expected, the Cabinet formed by Prime Minister ASQUITH differs materially from that constructed by his predecessor. It is true that only one resignation, that of Lord ELGIN, hitherto Colonial Secretary, has been accepted, but there have been two transfers from the House of Commons to the House of Lords, those of Mr. JOHN MORLEY and Sir H. H. FOWLER, who while retaining their previous posts of Secretary for India and Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster respectively have been made Viscounts. There have also been some important shiftings within the Cabinet, although Lord LOREBURNE, who it was reported might be superseded by Mr. HALDANE, is reappointed Lord High Chancellor. The Earl of CREWE, who was President of the Council, becomes Colonial Secretary and is replaced in his former office by Lord TREWENMOUTH, the First Lordship of the Admiralty passing to Mr. R. McKENNA, who was president of the Board of Education. Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, who was president of the Board of Trade, succeeds Mr. ASQUITH in the Chancellorship of the Exchequer, and thus becomes the Premier's chief lieutenant in the Commons. For the present Mr. R. BALDREY remains Secretary for War, Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE Home Secretary, Mr. ADOLPHUS BIRRELL Chief Secretary for Ireland, Mr. JOHN BURNS president of the Local Government Board, Mr. JOHN SINCLAIR Secretary for Scotland, Mr.

SIDNEY BUXTON, Postmaster-General, Earl CARRINGTON, president of the Board of Agriculture and the Hon. LEWIS HARCOURT, First Commissioner of Works.

The two new members of the Cabinet are Mr. WINSTON SPENCER CHURCHILL and Mr. WALTER RUNCIMAN, elevated from ministerial posts not of Cabinet rank to be president of the Board of Trade and president of the Board of Education respectively. It will be observed that these shiftings and promotions have caused four vacancies in the House of Commons. Three of the seats thus thrown open to contest the Liberals are confident of their ability to keep, but the Northwest division of Manchester, hitherto represented by Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL, will be bitterly fought for by the Unionists, who before the last general election controlled the district.

The purpose of these changes seems to be that the education bill, which has severely strained the relations of the Anglican and Nonconformist sections of the Liberal party, will be shelved for the present session at all events, and that the campaign against the House of Lords will not be pressed with much show of energy. The coalminers' eight hour bill, the protests against which have been widespread and vehement and which undoubtedly would raise the price of coal considerably, may also be dropped. The promotion of Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, ought to please the Laborites, and the retention of Mr. BIRRELL in the office of Chief Secretary for Ireland will unquestionably tend to conciliate the Irish Nationalists, especially as his scheme for a Catholic university at Dublin has given them great satisfaction. The effect that the reconstruction of the Cabinet and the Premier's withdrawal from the Chancellorship of the Exchequer will have upon the old age pension project will be watched with lively interest. On the whole it will be generally recognized that the new Cabinet is stronger than the old in administrative efficiency and would also be stronger in debate but for the removal of Mr. JOHN MORLEY to the House of Lords.

The Geographical Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

Since the acquisition of our insular possessions and the temporary domination of our Government over Cuba, the geographical jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States has become more extensive than that of any other tribunal except the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England. Cases which have arisen in remote corners of the globe now frequently come to Washington for final determination—as, for example, from Hawaii, the Philippine Islands, Cuba and Porto Rico. At the present term of the Supreme Court judgments have been reviewed involving the hereditary right of a titled Spanish lady to carry on the slaughter of cattle in the city of Havana in one case, and in another case the right of a Spanish lawyer to practise his profession in the courts of the Philippine Islands.

Dña MARIA FRANCISCA O'REILLY, Countess of Buena Vista, brought a suit against Major-General JOHN R. BROOKE of the United States Army for having wrongfully deprived her of the compensation to which she claimed to be entitled by reason of having inherited the privilege of carrying on the business of slaughtering at Havana. This privilege formerly appertained to the office of Alguacil-Mayor or High Sheriff of Havana. In 1878 that office was abolished by the Spanish Government which ordained, however, that its emoluments should continue to be paid to the ancestor of the complainant. In 1899, while Brigadier-General LUDLOW was military governor of Havana, that officer promulgated an order declaring that the grant connected with this office slaughter house, in which the O'REILLYS claimed the chief beneficial interest, was terminated. The Countess of Buena Vista appealed from this order to Major-General BROOKE, who was then the military governor of the whole island, but he refused to allow her appeal, declaring that it was prejudicial to the general welfare to continue to pay for official services after the office of Alguacil-Mayor had been abolished. The lady thereupon sued General BROOKE on the ground that his order constituted a legal wrong in violation of the law of nations and of the treaty of the United States with Spain made on December 10, 1898. The trial court decided against her and the Supreme Court of the United States has affirmed the decision in an opinion written by Mr. Justice HOLMES, holding, in accordance with the view expressed by Mr. ROOT when the matter came before him as Secretary of War, that the plaintiff had no property right which survived the extinction of the sovereignty of Spain over Cuba.

The Philippine case was an appeal from an order made by the Supreme Court of the islands denying the appellant's application to be admitted to practise law in the Philippine courts. The Treaty of Paris provided that Spanish subjects born in Spain might remain in the Philippines or remove therefrom, retaining in either event all their rights of property, and that they should also have the right to carry on their professions, being subject in that respect to such laws as were applicable to other foreigners. It appeared that the appellant had left the Philippines for Europe in May, 1899, and was absent until January, 1901, being most of the time in Barcelona. Both the Philippine Supreme Court and the Supreme Court of the United States held that he carried his Spanish nationality with him and did not become a citizen of the Philippines under the new sovereignty. A Spaniard is deemed a foreigner within the meaning of the treaty after the cessation of the islands, and as the local laws do not permit a foreigner to practise law the decision is that his application was properly denied.

The geographical extension of the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court so as to embrace causes arising in localities so far separated from one another carries with it a notable increase in the variety and interest of the cases presented for adjudication to that great tribunal. As we have suggested, this variety and interest is only surpassed by the jurisdiction of the English Privy Council.

The last volume of English Appeal Cases contains the judgments of the Privy Council in cases arising in Quebec, Ontario, New South Wales, Victoria, Natal, China, the Cape of Good Hope, British Guiana, British Columbia, New Zealand and Nova Scotia. In many of these cases, of course, an accurate knowledge of the local law is essential to a proper disposition of the appeals; and in order to secure such knowledge it is customary to appoint upon the Judicial Committee some lawyers who have had experience as Judges in the Colonies.

The Peacefulness of Hobson.

Captain RICHMOND P. HOBSON realizes that he is misunderstood in the House by both parties and by advocates of two new battleships and leaders for four. Does he demand the largest navy in the world because he worships military glory? The House ought to know better. His reproach still echoes in the corridors:

"I do not care how blooded a man may be before he goes in. Let him go in and take a taste of war and that will make of him a disciple of peace for the rest of his days. * * * When I think of the Spanish war my heart cries out, 'How long, how long must noble men continue to slay each other in this way?'"

So the Captain has made "1,700 speeches in the cities pleading for peace"—that is to say, for an American navy larger than the other navies of the world. To a question in the House by Mr. RAINY of Illinois, who was curious about the number of battleships we needed to defend our coast lines, Captain HOBSON replied by giving the naval programmes of other Powers and declaring that Congress ought to authorize six new battleships this year and four more each subsequent year.

"Mr. RAINY—How long would it take at this rate before developments occurred that would stop the building of four a year?"

"Mr. HOBSON—No one can foresee."

"Mr. RAINY—It might go to two or three hundred battleships, according to the gentleman's position."

"Mr. HOBSON—If the other nations built 200 each then we ought to build about 300. Now, please do not interrupt me in order to ask ridiculous questions. I do not yield, Mr. Chairman, for such questions."

"Mr. RAINY—How much will it cost to maintain these battleships?"

"The Chairman—The gentleman from Alabama declines to yield."

"Mr. RAINY—I thought he declined to yield to a ridiculous question and I am not asking ridiculous questions. [Applause.]

"Mr. HOBSON—Mr. Chairman, it is puerile for us to assume that we are not in any danger."

The House should have more patience with Captain HOBSON. His purpose stands revealed. He has given the House the key of his policy. Every man who "goes in," that is to say, goes to the front or goes down to the sea in ships to fight, is satisfied with his first experience and thereafter becomes an evangel of peace like Captain HOBSON. His dream then is easily comprehended. "The war clouds are gathering." A vast conflict involving many peoples and various races would not surprise him; indeed, he rather expects it, and while it would take an awful toll of life and treasure it would have its compensation—that is to say, it would cure the world of war, armies would be disbanded and navies dismantled, and international differences forever after would be referred to the Hague Tribunal.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW of Missouri would cure the world of war by talking about it in peace conferences. Mr. BURTON of Ohio would reach the same end by reducing naval estimates and setting other nations an example of moderation. Captain HOBSON sees the folly of both remedies, and having had his fill of war would extirpate it by the heroic measure of making it general just once. Any other explanation of his insatiable policy of building more battleships than all the nations of Europe and Asia combined is not lucid. It is a grand conception, but we fear that the House will continue to exhibit impatience with Captain HOBSON.

The Oklahoma National Guard.

In response to the demands of the labor agitator the Oklahoma Assembly has defeated a bill for the organization of a State militia. This will be regarded as a stupendous triumph in some quarters, perhaps, but its actual result is not likely to be what those who brought it about now imagine.

Nevada failed to maintain a national guard and at last called on the United States to preserve order. The United States did so just long enough to give the Nevada authorities opportunity to establish a State police force. Thus the refusal to provide a trained militia to act in emergencies caused the formation of a permanent force competent to meet any emergency that may arise, constantly on duty and controlled at all times by the officers of the State.

Oklahoma has not the excuse of poverty that Nevada had for neglecting to maintain a national guard, but the citizens of the State not improbably may need one. When they do they may find the remedy more unpalatable than the preventive.

A citizen of Watertown, N. Y., writes to THE SUN to say that the story that the Thirty-ninth Separate Company refused to march behind the band of the Twenty-fourth Infantry, U. S. A., had no other foundation than the loose talk of one member of the company. "We Watertownians," adds the writer, "honor the Twenty-fourth Regiment for its past record and deeds."

Ex-Pitover JOHN K. TENNER, future Representative in Congress from the Twenty-fourth Pennsylvania district, will find Catcher CANNON a backstop justly renowned for deft handling of the most puzzling curves, when he will, yet one who often fails to catch the straightest delivery from the tongue of frenzy and rebellion.

No one can doubt Florida's briskness after reading that "a dozen men were removed to hospitals within five minutes after their arrival" at Pensacola to accept employment at wages satisfactory to them.

"Entertaining" free labor at the rate of more than two a minute is a record SAM PARKS should have lived to enjoy.

At the Plymouth Convention.

Prisella smiled sweetly.
"Are you invited for Miles Standish or merely told to use every honorable means?" she inquired.
Herewith history began to make.

IF THOMAS JEFFERSON WERE HERE?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Were it possible for Jefferson, on the 16th anniversary of his birth, to return to earth possessed of all facts concerning the present unhappy condition of the country in whose service he had toiled unceasingly like a galley slave during half a century and he were asked whether he preferred Roosevelt or Bryan or Taft for the next President what would the answer be?

Could Hamilton come back and a similar inquiry be made of him what would be his reply?

The list of the illustrious to be called in conference might be extended to include the Presidents—Washington, Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln—whose birthdays are now remembered and celebrated by their countrymen. Madison and Marshall could be added.

They could be questioned as to preference by each among the visible four and more Democratic and half a dozen Republican aspirants for the White House.

It may be pertinent in passing, to ask why it is that in later days neither Bryan nor his partisans allude to Jackson, and, on the other hand, Roosevelt and Republicans should not mention and more tenderly for him.

Although Jefferson was brimming full of philanthropy, human kindness, sympathy and the rights of man, yet he could at times be vindictive and ferocious, as is shown in his autobiography and other writings. He might therefore, if shown what the present occupant of the White House has written of the third President, turn aside from Roosevelt's third term. Jefferson's resentment would naturally be aroused against a historian who had stripped him of proper honors, described him as fit for immediate membership of the Ananias Club and as the father of nullification and secession.

The founder of the Democratic party was by nature timorous and unready. He drew back from an open fight. He was not brave and pugnacious to a fault, and always ready, like Jackson, it is therefore not quite just to stigmatize one like Jefferson as a prevaricator when seeking to avoid open blows in controversy.

Nor is it quite a square deal in these days to refer to Jefferson as a nullifier and secessionist, as those who are now using these words know the sense in which the Kentucky resolutions of 1792 referred to State resistance to unconstitutional laws and to the "compact" of the Constitution. The two Federalist alien and addition laws enacted during the term of Jefferson's immediate predecessor in the White House were rather high handed and very unconstitutional. The Federalists having, as Jefferson fancied, retired into the national judiciary as into a fortress risky and desperate remedies were, it seems, deemed necessary by the Jeffersonian Democrats. Chief Justice Marshall had not then ascended, as he did later, thanks to the elder Adams, to the bench of the Supreme Court and demonstrated the true and better way to put an end to unconstitutional laws, State and Federal.

And besides, the conduct of New England Federalists not long after, when their commerce had been ruined or was in the process of ruin by the Democratic embargo and non-intercourse, showed that the device of indirect resistance to the resolutions of 1792 was prevalent in the political atmosphere of the whole country, and continued to be till Jackson by his victory at New Orleans stimulated pride in the new Constitution and the Union it embodied. By his dealings with South Carolina when President Jackson again arrested the tendency of 1792. No individuals and no States would nowadays take up nullification or secession, even if Congress did legislate to destroy interstate commerce. The Supreme Court would be asked to intervene. Marshall worked that change.

In the present Congress Northern Republicans and Southern Democrats have in the House beaten again the old Hamilton-Jefferson straw. That threshing show how enduring is the issue raised so long ago by those two very great Americans over the quantity and character of the power which by the voters shall be entrusted to the comparatively small governing class—the aristocracy in a republic—at Washington and in the several States.

One of the "big four" Republicans in the House deemed it important the other day to deny again that Jefferson is entitled to much credit for the Louisiana acquisition. His opponent did not ask how the acquisition could then have been made without Jefferson. He never denied the right to acquire. What he doubted was the right of a treaty to incorporate into the Union without the consent of Congress. Finally Jefferson yielded his doubts to the opinion of Congress that by proper laws the Constitution could be preserved and Louisiana acquired under the treaty. The question was admirably and exhaustively treated in the Supreme Court by Justice White in the Downes case, which was one among the so-called "insular cases." A quarter of a century later the Supreme Court decided the United States has "the power of acquiring territory either by conquest or treaty," as Jefferson had thought.

Under the whip and spur of persistent complaints that the country suffered from absence of adequate regulation of foreign and interstate commerce the Congress of the Confederation, which was in fact only a consultative body, recommended to the States, which approved, the assembling of another convention to consider the complaints. The result was a new Constitution and a new United States, part national and part Federal. They seem not to have quite satisfied Jefferson or Hamilton.

During Washington's first term Congress enacted Hamilton's plan for funding the public debt, assuming the State debts, chartering a national bank, protecting manufactures and doing other fiscal things which strengthened the national element in the new government and gratified the commercial classes, the capitalists such as then existing, whether benefactors or "malefactors," and attached them to the new order of things. The work was necessary. A strong Government was then needed. The Union would have gone to pieces without it. Jefferson was the defeat of his qualities incapable of such labor. He had no head for fiscal affairs. But Hamilton's work alienated the planters, farmers, laborers and masses. A curb, needed in our day, had to be applied to his nationalist theories. Jefferson organized the new party that made the application and prevented that violent reaction which may follow excessive class legislation by the money power. The powerful Democracy was thereby in its turn reconciled to the new Constitution of 1787; Jefferson was reelected with only 14 opposing electoral votes, and Madison followed after him. Thus the order of succession of those two giant antagonists, who created the political issues that have endured till our time, became the saviors of the new United States. And now a perversion of that very energetic character, the need of which, to some extent, the Constitution of 1787, is imperiling, as is seen in recent occurrences, that Constitution.

Will those who are celebrating to-day the anniversary of Jefferson's birth give a thought to that? A JEFFERSONIAN.
NEW YORK, April 13.

THE COST OF PEACE.

Senator Hale Taken to Task for Opposing Necessary Appropriations.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Less than a week ago the chairman of the Senate Committee, Senator Hale of Maine, considered it essential after the Senate had passed the army appropriation bill to state on the floor of the Senate with great apparent concern and solicitude that more than 70 per cent. of the total national revenues is being devoted to war past and to be, and then he invited his colleagues of the Senate to cut the naval appropriation bill to pieces when he, within the next few days, should place it before them.

This statement and invitation of Senator Hale offer an excellent example of grossly illogical deduction. In effect the Senator says that because we had a measure, non-effective army and navy in 1861 and therefore fought a long and most expensive war with volunteer forces, and consequently must now pay \$140,000,000 annually for pensions to volunteer soldiers, we must charge the war, the \$140,000,000 for pensions and the \$24,000,000 for pensions on the public debt against our present effective army and navy. We must cease to support our present effective army and navy and go back to the condition of military helplessness that invited the civil war, made it a protracted struggle involving tremendous life, enormous expenditures and huge penalties for forty-three years after the last gun was fired. If the army and navy had been on a footing as effective in 1861 as they are to-day the civil war would not have lasted a year and would have been perhaps altogether averted.

It is not the quality of the Senator's logic but the poor quality of his mathematics. The total appropriations for the last fiscal year amounted to \$920,000,000. Of this amount \$70,000,000 was for the army, \$90,000,000 for the navy, \$2,000,000 for the Military Academy, \$7,000,000 for fortifications, \$140,000,000 for pensions of the army and navy and \$24,000,000 for interest on the public debt. If we add all these together and charge their total, \$257,000,000, against the Regular army and navy we find it amounts to less than 30 per cent. of the total annual appropriations instead of more than 70 per cent., as stated by Senator Hale. It is not due to a lack of knowledge of the elementary rules of arithmetic.

It would be much more logical and much more in accordance with the facts to consider the \$140,000,000 for pensions and the \$24,000,000 for interest on the public debt as a charge that has been incurred by reason of our neglect previous to 1861 to support an effective army and navy.

To put the matter in concrete form, we have the choice of two systems: we can expend \$200,000,000 a year in the maintenance of an effective army and navy or we can avoid war, or we can expend \$150,000,000 a year on an inadequate army and navy and invite war involving great loss of life, property and national prestige, a huge public debt and an annual pension roll of \$150,000,000.

The people of this country are fortunately blessed with ample patriotism and good common sense, and they have in the national platform of the two great parties emphatically and wisely placed themselves on record as desiring the first named system.

AMERICAN CITIZEN.
NEW YORK, April 13.

The Hon. Jim Sherman—A Republican Who Leads.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Is Congressman Sherman who presided over the Republican State convention on Saturday the one who in the autumn of 1906 imported Harriman for predatory money to aid Republicans in Congress elections, and when refused reported the refusal straightway at the White House, uncovered the money negotiations in 1904 between Roosevelt and Harriman and precipitated the railroad persecutions forthwith begun? INQUIRER.
NEW YORK, April 13.

The Mystery of Washington Pie.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: The recipes for Washington pie in THE SUN of Sunday are as far from the truth as possible. The Washington pie of my boyhood was a hungry boy—say that is about all one can say for it—and is made from a mixture of all the broken cakes and crumbs from the baker's showcases.

As I sit with my broom and I were trodding home with our small wagon loaded with groceries and our pockets burning from a nickel our man gave us to spend. We halted in front of a bakery and after surveying the tempting display and disbelieving the money of the baker to what we could get the most for our nickel we decided on nice looking squares which appeared to have icing on top.

They were five inches square and cost two cents each. My brother went in and made two purchases. We got under way and were about two blocks from the place when we opened our prize and found the icing was a nice white bottom crust (the pie having been turned upside down for eating purposes). We bit into it and found it was a very good thing, but we could not stand for such a bunce and although I walked all the way back to our friend the baker, and getting no satisfaction out of him I went home and made two more pies all over his windows to get square.

That was my first and last experience with the genuine Washington pie.
NEW YORK, April 13.

A Breadstake for Woman Suffrage.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Wellesley, Smith and Bryn Mawr colleges and Boston University were represented at a meeting of the College Equal Suffrage League of Massachusetts held in Boston April 10. The following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas the chief objection made to granting the ballot to women is the vote of the 'foreign women, the ignorant women and the bad women,' and also the fact that the United States has more than three times as many native born women (32,467,041) as all the foreign men and women put together (10,341,278); that women constitute only 34 per cent. of the prisoners, and that the high school of every State in the Union are probably more girls than boys, because of the tendency to take boys out of school early in order to put them into business."

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.
DORCHESTER, MASS., April 12.

Job for the Department of Health.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Is there any remedy or redress for a night toiler whose sleep is disturbed in this city? In the apartment house wherein I reside the first floor occupants have a small roof extending from their bedroom window. This is used as a general recreation ground. A foreigner erroneously termed a domestic laborer is in the habit of dragging out carpets, placing them on a line and then beating them to pieces.

The result is that with open windows sleep is out of the question, and we must have the benefit of all the rain and snow that comes down from anywhere between 8 o'clock and 10 o'clock, and continue indefinitely. Is there not a law to prevent that carpet beating?

F. C. C.
NEW YORK, April 12.

Suffices.

Mrs. Knicker—"The Servant in the House" a miracle play.
Mrs. Becker—"The title proves it."

THE CURSE OF THE COCKTAIL.
O Roman punch! O potent cocktail!
O maraschino! O maraschino!
Delicious drink! Why have you not the art to kill this gnawing bookworm in my heart?

To kill you grudge the worm his daily bread,
So virtuously you will do him to death,
Or till the fainting cocktail, "bait with claws,"
To kill the fainting bookworm while he gnaws.

The man who knows not today from cocktail,
Is fit for prohibition or blackmail.
The one is mellow, staid, by no means risky;
The other softly wicked, gay and frisky.

A woman's heart is gold, with some alloy.
A cocktail is a dream of trickling joy.
We welcome both, but we must choose the wiser,
We will not analyze a drink, we must choose the wiser.

Three things there are, no drugs will cure,
That inclination brings their victims sure,
Religion, cocktails and a woman's mind
Are mystic compounds not to be defined.

O liquid warbler! Virtuous Othello!
O Tetrastich! Tetrastich!
For all your machines conquest of Rosalind,
Life's timid child is still in—DEMY MARCEL!
CHARLES FREDERICK STANBROOK.

THE REFORM OF MATHEMATICS.

A Call to Mr. O'Phelan to Make Clear to the Academic Mind His Discoveries.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: It is certainly a pity that the world should remain in ignorance of the discoveries of Mr. O'Phelan in the realm of mathematics. I confess that I am one of those who love the old "abominations," notwithstanding the fact that I have subjected them to much thought and searching analysis for many years. However, we are surely able to put aside our prejudices and let Mr. O'Phelan convince us of the correctness of his views.

We should remember the bitter controversies among the French mathematicians at the end of the eighteenth century concerning the validity of processes based on the differential calculus, many wishing to stop at the purely algebraic methods of analysis as involved in the coordinate geometry of Descartes. It is not necessary to discuss the results of these reactionary tendencies, except in so far as they have led mathematicians to investigate the validity of space concepts and the assumed axioms of the Euclidean method. In this direction it may be that Mr. O'Phelan can do good work, and under his guidance we shall be prepared to enter the realm of hyper space and the nth dimension, perchance to uncover untold treasures of thought in the infinite domain of static truths and dynamic laws.

For the present it appears that his contentions lack sophistication and are weakly founded. With regard to his discoveries in plane and spherical trigonometry he should certainly let us have them, as they may lead to a new definition of the trigonometric method. He undoubtedly agrees with me that considerable harm is done to the immature mathematical mind through the representation of the trigonometric functions by means of lines, particularly in the analytical branches of the science. The fact that these functions are similar ratios and have no dimension whatever cannot be too strongly impressed on the student. If we are to cast out the beautiful methods of coordinate analysis in the investigation of the properties of conic sections we should surely have first presented for our consideration the new methods elaborated by Mr. O'Phelan. In rejecting the method of Leibnitz, does he still retain the method of fluxions as proposed by Newton? In basing a calculus on the theory of limits we better impress upon the mind the principles of continuity, and are led into no error by so doing. Results derived by both methods are identical.

Mr. O'Phelan's objection to the use of differentials in connection with trigonometric quantities and logarithms is too vague to be properly analyzed, but it would certainly be a pity to let the beautiful exponential functions involving the base of the Napierian system of logarithms by means of which we make so many beautiful trigonometric relations, and which in connection with the theory of imaginaries are indispensable in the treatment of harmonic motions and the principles of resonance. In the expression

$$y = e^{i\omega t} \sin \omega t$$
where i is infinitely small and ω is negligible, why write the latter term at all? In fact, why write any of it, for if i is infinitely small we can simply use the trigonometric function, which is interesting to have Mr. O'Phelan's application of such an expression as this to mathematical science.

AMERICAN CITIZEN.
NEW YORK, April 13.

Mr. O'Phelan's Objection to the Use of Differentials.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: I must confess that I read Mr. O'Phelan's letter of Friday with no little amusement. It is certainly very startling to find suddenly that all our principles of mathematical reasoning are entirely wrong. But since our mathematics have supported engineering, which has accomplished so much, why is this mathematics inadequate? I for one would certainly desire further information from Mr. O'Phelan, as I am sure that he has been able to find correct all these abominable errors, why does he not put his own works on the market instead of writing editorial letters all the time? I should be pleased to purchase this reform edition.

NEW YORK, April 12.
P. S.—Could Mr. O'Phelan agree with Archimedes?

MR. ASQUITH.

Career and Character of the New Prime Minister.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: The appointment of Mr. Asquith as Prime Minister of Great Britain is notable in many respects. In the first place he is an eminent lawyer. In America of late years our statesmen and Presidents have been men who have been called to the office by the very reverse is the case in England, where it has become a proverb that "good lawyers make bad legislators." In the list of twenty-three Prime Ministers from the time of William Pitt Mr. Asquith is the first eminent lawyer who has become Premier. Lord Melbourne was the necessary number of lawyers at Lincoln's Inn and Darnley was a lawyer's clerk, but they were not practicing barristers. Herbert Henry Asquith is a lawyer of eminence. He is a King's Counsel and has appeared in a number of important cases. He has become Premier of Ireland before the Parnell commission, and at that time occasioned considerable attention. In 1891 he appeared for the defense in the notorious Baccarat trial and succeeded in placing the future King (then Prince of Wales) in the dock.